# ICFHR 2014 COMPETITION ON HANDWRITTEN KEYWORD SPOTTING (H-KWS 2014)

### **IOANNIS PRATIKAKIS<sup>1</sup>**

**KONSTANTINOS ZAGORIS**<sup>1,2</sup>

**BASILIS GATOS**<sup>2</sup>

**GEORGIOS LOULOUDIS<sup>2</sup>** 

NIKOLAOS STAMATOPOULOS<sup>2</sup>

Visual Computing Group Democritus University of Thrace Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering Xanthi, Greece

 <sup>2</sup> National Centre of Scientific Research "Demokritos" Institute of Informatics and Telecommunications Athens, Greece

## **INTRODUCING ICFHR 2014 H-KWS**

Handwritten keyword spotting is the task of detecting query words in handwritten document image collections without explicitly recognizing it.

The objective of the H-KWS 2014 is threefold:

- Record current advances in keyword spotting.
- Provide **benchmarking handwritten datasets** containing both historical and modern documents from multiple writers.
- Explore **established evaluation performance measures** frequently encountered in the information retrieval literature while providing the **software** for these measures as **implementation reference**.

# **ORGANIZING ICFHR 2014 H-KWS**

### **TRACK I - SEGMENTATION-BASED**

- 50 document images of Bentham dataset.
- 100 document images of Modern dataset (25 documents per language).
- Word Location in XML format.

### **TRACK II - SEGMENTATION-FREE**

- 50 document images of Bentham dataset.
- 100 document images of Modern dataset (25 documents per language).

### **ICFHR 2014 H-KWS TIMELINE**



gunpourden not properly secured ; and you, being at a disstance and knowing him to be deaf, throw a stick at him which heats the candle out of his hand on knocks him down before he gets open the door.

But the absaulter shall make compensation to the party absaulted and accine that on more from the nighibour hood thus saired. Itaw the neighbour hood is to be made to pay - See in the Saw of Canish - Taxees.

For the cases in which it is lawful to trespass against The persons of others in order to guard against Danger 1. Trom the fall of buildings the Laws concerning recinous builds 2. Trom inumbation . See the Law concerning Inumbation . 3. "From the sinking or stranding of navigable Vefsels. See the Sea faring - man's Saw. 4. From the Explosion of Gunpounder. See Laws concerning the heeping and carriage of Gun pourden. 5. From Fire. See 1. Laws concerning buildings 2. The House. inolder's Law concerning accidents by Fine. 3. The Sea faring man's Law . That concerning accidents by Tice . 5. The miners Law - Seet concerning accidents by Line. G. The Turpertine Distiller's Law ; Sect. Concerning accidents by Sire J. The fun Der's

S. 2. Composition: muller. of Quesi furone the ond many and the Scheet. Att. 9. In every Quan Jury that a deading voice may never he wanting, the number of ducin Jurovs, is an and mundeer: ordinary under three. Gor this or that particular purpose, the degislature will give en encase to the number, if and where it Sees evenent. Humber of the ordinary at hast twice as great as of the Select. ; ett. 5. For appropriate monal aptitude & thence for giving determination to the will of the aggregate hady, the ordinary are more particularly louted to: their interest being that of the greatest under: for appropriate intellectual & active ap. -titude, for information & occasional and and guid. ance to the judgement of less or their colleagues, the filest. ett. 4. Joreman a Select Juryman: saving to the majority the power of locating out of their own under Fifteent one. S.3.

# **BENTHAM DATASET**

It consists of high quality (approximately 3000 pixel width and 4000 pixel height) handwritten manuscripts.

The documents are written by Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) himself as well as by Bentham's secretarial staff over a period of sixty years. Démocrite d'Abdère étoit un philosophe grec souvent classé parmi les Présocratiques du point de vue philosophique, bien qu'il soit un peu plus jeune que Socrate, et qu'il soit mort quelques trente années après Socrate. Il est considéré comme un philosophe matérialiste en raison de sa conviction en un Univers constitué d'atomes et de vide, théorie atomiste. Pour

Démocrite la nature est composée dans son ensemble de dans principes: les atomes et le vide. L'existence des atomes peut être déduite de ce principe: Rien ne vient du néant, et rien, après avoir été détruit, n'y retourne. Il y a ainsi taijours du plein, i.e. de l'être, et le non-être est le vide. Les atomes sont des corpuscules selides et indivisibles, séparés par des intervalles vides, et dont la taille fait qu'ils échappent à nos sens. Décrits comme lisses ou rudes, crochus, recourbés ou ronds, ils ne peuvent être offectés ou modifiés à cause de laur durcté. Ο Σωκράτης δίδασκε ότι η αρετή τουτίζετοι DE THU BOCHIO HOU an' autin Anoppiour ôtes or àttes aperés, prari aurés eivar to Uniprato avadó kau TAN avTIMapipaxe 6Ta axaya nou yavrajar ajiojnikeuza 619 λαίκή ευνείδηση, την ομορφιά, τον πλούτο, The Suraph, The imparish at the Tis n Soves TWY aLGONGLEWY. H LOLTON SIKN TOU Σωκράτη 6το διεσστήριο μοιάζει πάρα πολύ γε αυτήν του Χριωτού. Ο Σωκράτης 610 Sikobrippio àkpa gitobogitos der ENALMAPHOE, BEY EXAQUE, DEN KOLTEUNE GE anodories adda ouvésebe anodura διδασκαλία και πράζει. Ο Χριστός ήλθε για va Oublabrei tou yi auto brous bitabres TOU SER anoroginonce wore va oovatwoei propúvias katóniv va avabindei anoburviortas The Deiry unobrash Tou. TEARD 600 Sebenery & Jun tou ye The Sibabladia TOU where The Bright TOU Davatou stor staupo jortaer and zor πατέρα του να ωχχωρήσει τους anopunous diore der grupijour zi rarour WE to to tor braupiron.

### **MODERN DATASET**

It consists of **modern handwritten documents** from the ICDAR 2009 Handwritten Segmentation Contest.

These documents originate from **several writers** that were asked to copy a given text.

They do not include any nontext elements (lines, drawings, etc.).

They are written in four (4) languages: **English**, **French**, **German** and **Greek**.

### **BENTHAM**



### MODERN

together together together

### **CHALLENGES**

They both contain several very difficult problems to be addressed, wherein the most difficult is the word variability.

The variation of the same word is high and involves:

- writing style
- font size
- noise
- their combination

### **WORD-LENGTH STATISTICS FOR EACH DATASET**

BENTHAM





**MODERN** 

TRACK I TRACK II

# **QUERY STATISTICS**

The query set of each dataset is provided in XML format and it contains word image queries of length greater than 6 and frequency greater than 5.

#### **TRACK I - SEGMENTATION-BASED**

- 320 queries for the Bentham Database
- 300 queries for the Modern Database

#### **TRACK II - SEGMENTATION-FREE**

- 290 queries for the Bentham Database
- 300 queries for the Modern Database



TRACK I - Bentham TRACK I - Modern TRACK II - Bentham TRACK II - Modern

TRACK I - Bentham TRACK I - Modern TRACK II - Bentham TRACK II - Modern2

# http://vc.ee.duth.gr/H-KWS2014/#Datasets



## **EVALUATION CHALLENGES**

- Small variations of the query word that can be found in the datasets. For example the word "husband" appears as well as :
  - husband,
  - husband:
  - husband.
  - Husband.
  - Husband]
- Evaluating overall performance as well as precision.
- Segmentation free systems may not detect the whole word or include parts of another word.

## **CHOSEN EVALUATION MEASURES**

- **Precision at Top 5 Retrieved words (P@5)** for evaluating precision performance.
- The Mean Average Precision (MAP) for evaluating overall performance.
- Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) with binary judgment relevancies for evaluating precision-oriented overall performance.
- Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) with non-binary judgment relevancies for evaluating small variations of the query word.

# PRECISION AT TOP K RETRIEVED WORD (P@K)

**Precision** is the fraction of retrieved words that are relevant to the query.

**P@k** is the precision for the **k top** retrieved **words**.

•

In the proposed evaluation, **P@5** is used which is the precision at **top 5** retrieved **words**.

This metric defines how successfully the algorithms produce relevant results to the first 5 positions of the ranking list.

$$P@k = \frac{|\{relevant words\} \cap \{k \ retrieved \ words\}|}{|\{k \ retrieved \ words\}|}$$

# **MEAN AVERAGE PRECISION (MAP)**

It is a typical measure for the performance of information retrieval systems.

It is implemented from the Text REtrieval Conference (TREC) community by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

It is defined as the average of the precision value obtained after each relevant word is retrieved:

$$AP = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( P @K \times rel(k) \right)}{\{relevant words\}} \qquad \text{where:} \quad rel(k) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if word at rank } k \text{ is relevant} \\ 0, & \text{if word at rank } k \text{ is not relevant} \end{cases}$$

### **NORMALIZED DISCOUNTED CUMULATIVE GAIN (NDCG)**

The NDCG measures the performance of a retrieval system based on the graded relevance of the retrieved entities.

It varies from 0.0 to 1.0, with 1.0 representing the ideal ranking of the entities.

It is defined as:

$$nDCG = \frac{DCG}{IDCG}$$
 where:  $DCG = rel_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{rel_i}{log_2(i+1)}$ 

*rel<sub>i</sub>* is the relevance judgment at position *i* and *IDCG* is the ideal *DCG* which is computed from the perfect retrieval result.

### NON-BINARY VS BINARY RELEVANCE JUDGMENT VALUES

#### **NON-BINARY**

#### **BINARY**

Word	Relevance Judgment	Word	Relevance Judgment
husband	1.0	husband	1.0
husband	1.0	husband	1.0
husband	1.0	husband	1.0
husband	1.0	husband	1.0
husband	1.0	husband	1.0
husband,	0.9	husband,	1.0
husband:	0.9	husband:	1.0
husband.	0.9	husband.	1.0
Husband.	0.8	Husband.	1.0
Husband]	0.8	Husband]	1.0

### **SEGMENTATION – FREE OVERLAPPING THRESHOLD**

A word instance is considered as detected only if there is a **significant overlap** with the ground truth word.

The overlap is expressed by the **intersection** over the **ground truth word area** metric (*IOA*) and it is defined as:

 $IOA = \frac{A \cap B}{A}$ 

where *A* and *B* denote the bounding box areas of the ground truth word and the method output word, respectively.

The *IOA* metric ranges from 0 to 1, where 1 corresponds to exact matching.

A **threshold** *T* is applied in order to decide whether the word instance and the segmented word match sufficiently.

The performance evaluation for three different thresholds (**0.6**, **0.7** and **0.8**) is used for testing.

# **EVALUATION APPLICATION**

- An evaluation application is developed as referenced implementation for each metric.
- It is available for **Windows**, **Mac OS X** and **Linux** operating systems as both **command-line** and **GUI** form.
- It accepts as input the **experimental results file** and the **relevance judgment file**, which represents the ground truth. Afterwards, it calculates the aforementioned evaluation metrics.



# http://vc.ee.duth.gr/H-KWS2014/#VCGEval



#### **Visual Computing Group Evaluation Tool**



GUI Version Console Version Requirements: .NET Framework 4.0 and above



GUI Version Console Version Requirements: Mono framework 3.2 and above



GUI Version Console Version

Requirements: Mono framework 3.2 and above

# http://vc.ee.duth.gr/H-KWS2014/#Resources



### PARTICIPANTS

Method	Affiliation	Participating
G1	The Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Israel	DOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
G2	Computer Vision Center, Barcelona, Spain	C <sup>©</sup> Centre de Visió per Computador TRACK I
G3	Smith College Department of Computer Science, Northampton MA, USA	MITH COLLEGE TRACK I TRACK II
G4	Université de Lyon, CNRS INSA - Lyon, LIRIS, France	TRACK II
G5	Institute for Communications Technology (IfN) of Technische Universität Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany	Technische Universität Braunschweig

### **TRACK I: SEGMENTATION-BASED - EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

#### **BENTHAM DATASET**

#### **MODERN DATASET**

Method	P@5	MAP	NDCG(Binary)	NDCG	Method	P@5	MAP	NDCG(Binary)	NDCG
G1	0.738 ( <b>1</b> )	0.524 ( <b>1</b> )	0.742 ( <b>2</b> )	0.762 ( <b>2</b> )	G1	0.588 ( <b>2</b> )	0.338 ( <b>2</b> )	0.611 ( <b>2</b> )	0.612 ( <b>2</b> )
G2	0.724 ( <b>2</b> )	0.513 ( <b>2</b> )	0.744 ( <b>1</b> )	0.764 ( <b>1</b> )	G2	0.706 ( <b>1</b> )	0.523 ( <b>1</b> )	0.757 ( <b>1</b> )	0.757 ( <b>1</b> )
G3	0.718 ( <b>3</b> )	0.462 ( <b>3</b> )	0.638 ( <b>3</b> )	0.657 ( <b>3</b> )	G3	0.569 ( <b>3</b> )	0.278 ( <b>3</b> )	0.484 <b>(3</b> )	0.484 <b>(3</b> )

### **TRACK I: SEGMENTATION-BASED - PRECISION – RECALL CURVES**



# **TRACK II: SEGMENTATION-FREE - EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

### **BENTHAM DATASET**

		P	<b>P@5</b>			M	AP			NDCG (	Binary)			NI	CG	
	Overlap	ping Th	reshold		Overlap	ping Thre	shold		Overlap	ping Thre	eshold		Overlap	ping Thre	shold	
Method	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average
G1	0.617	0.611	0.599	0.609 ( <b>1</b> )	0.428	0.419	0.402	0.416 ( <b>1</b> )	0.653	0.640	0.621	0.638 ( <b>1</b> )	0.671	0.657	0.640	0.560 ( <b>1</b> )
G3	0.596	0.568	0.506	0.556 ( <b>2</b> )	0.397	0.372	0.321	0.363 ( <b>2</b> )	0.551	0.518	0.457	0.509 ( <b>2</b> )	0.569	0.536	0.474	0.526 ( <mark>2</mark> )
G4	0.351	0.341	0.313	0.335 ( <b>4</b> )	0.219	0.209	0.187	0.205 ( <b>4</b> )	0.386	0.363	0.319	0.356 ( <b>4</b> )	0.400	0.376	0.331	0.369 ( <b>4</b> )
G5	0.597	0.55	0.477	0.543 ( <b>3</b> )	0.385	0.347	0.280	0.337( <b>3</b> )	0.569	0.513	0.424	0.502 ( <b>3</b> )	0.586	0.531	0.440	0.519 ( <b>3</b> )

### **MODERN DATASET**

		F	P@5			М	IAP			NDCG (	Binary)	)		NI	DCG	
Mull	Overla	oping Th	reshold		Overlap	ping Thre	eshold		Overlap	ping Thre	shold		Overlap	ping Thre	eshold	4
Method	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	Average
G1	0.541	0.541	0.535	0.539 ( <b>1</b> )	0.265	0.265	0.259	0.263 (1)	0.491	0.484	0.473	0.483 ( <b>1</b> )	0.491	0.485	0.474	0.483 ( <b>1</b> )
G3	0.429	0.422	0.399	0.417 ( <b>2</b> )	0.170	0.165	0.152	0.163 ( <b>2</b> )	0.310	0.301	0.277	0.296 ( <b>2</b> )	0.310	0.301	0.277	0.296 ( <b>2</b> )
G4	0.250	0.241	0.211	0.234 ( <b>4</b> )	0.095	0.089	0.077	0.087 ( <b>4</b> )	0.218	0.195	0.161	0.191 ( <b>4</b> )	0.218	0.195	0.161	0.191 ( <b>4</b> )
G5	0.264	0.247	0.223	0.245 ( <b>3</b> )	0.100	0.092	0.081	0.091 ( <b>3</b> )	0.229	0.201	0.168	0.199 ( <b>3</b> )	0.229	0.202	0.168	0.200 ( <b>3</b> )

### **TRACK I: SEGMENTATION-BASED - PRECISION – RECALL CURVES**



### **FINAL RANKING**

### **TRACK I: SEGMENTATION-BASED**

Rank	Method	Score
1	G2	10
2	G1	14
3	G3	24

### **TRACK II: SEGMENTATION-FREE**

Rank	Method	Score	
1	G1	8	
2	G3	16	
3	G5	24	
4	G4	32	

# **AND THE WINNER IS:**

### **FOR TRACK I – SEGMENTATION-BASED:**

Method **G2** which has been submitted by **Jon Almazán, Albert Gordo, Ernest Valveny** 

affiliated to the:

Computer Vision Center, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.



**TRACK II – SEGMENTATION-FREE** 

Method **G1** which has been submitted by **Alon Kovalchuk, Lior Wolf, Nachum Dershowitz** 

affiliated to the:

Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Israel.

THE BLAVATNIK SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY